

it can put through a plan like this, why can it not go just a bit farther and establish a yearly wage plan? Yearly wages in a half-dozen basic industries would probably do more to break the economic jam than any move so far made, either by the government or by industry itself.

Demonic Germany and the Predicament of Humanity

IT IS a horror stricken world that contemplates the reign of implacable cruelty which now grips the German people. That such a phenomenon as the anti-Semitic pogrom could appear in Western society seemed at first incredible—in a society that has been for centuries impregnated with the principles of the Christian faith. But doubts concerning the authenticity of the news have had to give way as report follows report. An inexorable purpose to annihilate the Jewish population of Germany is revealed by new acts of brutality and exploitation and by calculated pronouncements of nazi purpose.

The most terrible aspect of the whole matter is the wanton hardness of heart with which the makers of German policy go about their bloody business. There is no vacillation. The brutish purpose expressed in nazi speeches makes it plain that Germany is determined to provoke in the outside world such sympathy for its victims that other nations will be compelled by sheer humanity to undertake the solution of the Jewish problem on Germany's behalf.

To all the appeal and protest by other nations the German leaders reply, "If you like the Jews so much, you can have them! The depth of this debasement of human sensibility was reached in the speech of Gobbels, who declared with an obscene sneer: "We do not want to export anti-Semitism; we want to export Semites. Supposing the whole world were anti-Semitic, how should we rid ourselves of our Jews? It is our wish that the world may become so pro-Jewish that it will take our Jews off our hands!"

Such fiendish and shameless relapse from the most elemental instincts which actuate civilized humanity, not to mention the spirit of Christianity, indicates, that in the nazi regime the modern world confronts a phenomenon for dealing with which it has no experience or precedent. Mr. Hoover goes back for the nearest precedent to Torquemada whose bloodthirsty Inquisition drove a million Jews from Spain. But in the fifteenth century there was no such sense of world-wide obligation to humanity as that which has been slowly created by science and democracy and a reformed Christianity since the Dark Ages.

How can the enlightened and outraged conscience of mankind express itself in the teeth of such an outburst of infernal lust? If it were 1914 the impulsive answer would be, "Let us march against Germany and make the world safe for humanity!" Let us destroy the demonic despotism that has usurped control of the German people and set not only Jews but the German people themselves free! This impulse, if it were 1914, would be rationalized by making a distinction between the German government and the German people, and affirming that the people would

welcome our invading armies, as their deliverer from a hated tyranny. But it would now be generally agreed that any such proposal lacks realism. The very fact that fifteen years after the German people were "liberated" from the Hohenzoellern "yoke," they voluntarily put themselves and their destiny in the hands of Hitler, well aware of his purposes, which had been openly avowed, has destroyed the last shred of optimistic idealism under which the World War was fought.

Moreover, the instinctive prompting to rush into war with Germany, even though the cause is ten times more substantial than that which challenged us in 1914-17, is inhibited both by fear of defeat and by fear of victory. No doubt the situation which France and Britain confronted only two months ago would have been met with war had the democracies approached it in the mood of 1914. But the enlightened and sane nations of the West now see that in a war with Germany they have everything to lose in defeat and nothing to gain in victory—nothing to gain in victory unless they are willing to pay a price for ultimate appeasement which none of them is willing to pay. Even the Jews would gain nothing in the victory of their champions, and defeat would only spread the poison of anti-Semitism.

Short of military measures, what then can be done? Proposals are being made on all sides. One is to set apart a territory in some part of the world to which the Jews can be transported and where they will be able to develop an autonomous society. The island of Madagascar and a territory in South Africa are frequently mentioned for this purpose. Mr. Chamberlain has told Parliament that his government would consent to the opening of Tanganyika, one of Germany's pre-war colonies, or British Guiana, on the northeast coast of South America, for "involuntary refugees" from Germany. Australia, which has a vast extent of thinly populated territory, would seem in theory to afford a logical sanctuary, but the Australians violently object. As for South Africa, the British and Dutch population is as anti-Semitic as Germany, and would oppose the importation of Jews to their own and probably to contiguous countries, even to the point of blocking it by force. Palestine is out of the question, in view of the failure of the British mandate to attain some *modus vivendi* as between Jews and Arabs.

Another proposal, and one which primarily concerns America, is to distribute Jewish refugees among those nations that will receive them, by a quota system to be agreed upon. In such an arrangement the United States would be expected to take the lion's share. The size of our country and its large population make plausible the contention that an additional 100,000 or so of Jewish immigrants could be absorbed without difficulty. Moreover, the United States has since its beginning provided asylum for the persecuted in other lands. It would seem to be in the line of its past policy as well as of its present duty for Congress to revise the immigration law so as to admit tens of thousands of Germany's victims. Propaganda to this end is in full tide, and there are indications that it may receive the support of the President.

It is easy for good people to give this proposal their support, because it does give them the sense of doing something, something virtuous and unselfish. People cannot

endure to hold their wrath against Germany and their sympathy for the Jews pent up in their breasts. An outlet is demanded—some practical and immediate measure by which the plight of the Jews may be relieved. Let the United States, therefore, set a good example to the rest of the world by welcoming the Jews. It is uncritically assumed that this proposal is a solution. But when carefully examined it discloses evils as great as those which it is designed to cure.

In the first place, the unrealism which characterizes the proposal for mass transportation to a new land, applies to this proposal also. But even if all the Jews could be induced to leave Germany, the nations of the world have no intention of opening their ports to receive so great an influx. The quotas suggested, even if the nations would accept them, would still leave the great mass of Jews in Germany. No problem would be solved.

Any plan to do something for the Jews is unrealistic if it does not take into account the all but universal existence of anti-Semitism. It is difficult for a Christian pen to write such a statement of fact, but in facing a proposal to save the Jews of Germany, this fact cannot be forgotten. The plan to distribute them among the more benign nations would at the utmost care for a bare fraction, and would not in any degree solve the problem which German hate and inhumanity have created.

There are those who would reply to this statement by saying, "Then let the United States alone receive them; let us revise our immigration laws and return to our former policy of extending a welcome to the oppressed. In certain quarters this policy or its equivalent is now being advocated. Its advocacy is placed on high moral grounds. This, it is said, is what our great, free democracy ought to do. Ideally, such a policy makes a strong appeal to the American spirit. It would be a magnificent gesture in line with the basic theory of our government that 'all men are created free and equal,' and should be equally guaranteed the right to 'life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.'"

But unhappily it is a condition, not an ideal theory, that confronts the high-minded sympathetic American. There are specific considerations which make it highly inadvisable to let down our immigration barriers. One is the economic condition of the country with its ten million unemployed, and the precarious tenure of millions of others on their means of earning a livelihood. To admit an appreciable number of Jews, all of them forced to a status of indigence before they are allowed to leave Germany, would add just that much more to the economic chaos.

Not only so, but it requires only a simple act of imagination to envisage the social effect of such a policy. No doubt those who advocate it do so on the complacent assumption that there is no Jewish problem in this country. We have solved that problem, they say, in the good "American way." But this is a wishful judgment, expressive of our ideals, but not of the realities. Dr. Clinchy directs attention in his article in this issue to the strong current of anti-Semitism here. And this current touches thousands who do not confess it, least of all in a questionnaire.

This wicked obsession which exists in America hardly less than in pre-Hitlerian Germany could be more easily

whipped into overt fanaticism than those who attend the round table conferences of Jews, Catholics and Protestants seem to imagine. Such conferences, proceeding for the most part in the upper air of sentiment and idealism, are likely to give the public as well as the participants a false conception of the realities of our social life. The importation of an appreciable number of Jews at this time would become at once the occasion for which our "Silver Shirts" and anti-Semitic "bunds" are waiting. It would be a tragic disservice to the Jews in America to increase their number by substantial immigration, and would hardly contribute at all to the alleviation of the anguish of the Jews in Germany.

The Jewish problem in America, while presenting unique aspects, is part of a vastly larger social problem. There is a major premise upon which all such proposals to relax our immigration restrictions must be considered. This premise is the fact that the United States has already on its hands a task in social integration unlike that which any other nation in the world confronts. In the first place, our forefathers brought to our shores a million black men to be our slaves. They now number more than one-tenth of our total population. Besides, our long time policy of open immigration has drawn together a people composed of many nationalities and races. Groupings that are wholly irrelevant to our common national life persist among us with unexpected tenacity. The cleavages between these groups close all too slowly. The democratic process is working none too well in American society. Our practical partisan politics, and the actual administration of our laws, instead of working to integrate these groups in a single nationality, tends to exploit them. This hyphenism is kept alive far beyond the normal period otherwise required for a previous allegiance to be absorbed in common loyalty to America.

All this compels American policy to take account, not merely of its sympathies and its abstract ideals, but of the instabilities and perils of America's own social order. There is no ethical principle that requires either an individual person or a nation to expose itself to a condition sure to involve a moral overstrain. The success of the American experiment in projecting a democratic nation composed of elements so heterogeneous, demands that instead of inviting further complications by relaxing our immigration laws, these laws be maintained or even further tightened. Christian and other high-minded citizens have no need to feel apologetic for the limitations upon immigration into this country. It is ethically arguable that this limitation should have been established years before Congress became alive to its necessity.

With respect to the specific Jewish problem created by German inhumanity, this editorial, therefore, seems to end in a blind alley. We make no attempt to disguise our bafflement. Every ameliorative service that can be rendered the victims should be rendered. Public opinion in every land, and particularly in our own, should be given ample opportunity for expressing itself in outraged protest. Those nations which can receive refugees should do so. If we seem skeptical of the practicality of many of the present proposals for mass deportation to far away and unoccupied territories, we shall rejoice if events prove that we were of too little faith. Meantime the solution of the